

REMARKS

1. In response to the restriction requirement, applicants have amended Markush claim 5 to limit it to the elected species SEQ ID NO:2. It is noted that this is not a substantive amendment, i.e., it doesn't create a file wrapper estoppel.

2. In response to the written description rejection applicants have limited claim 5 to the isolated protein (i), i.e., they have dropped the T cell epitope/subsequence coverage. This moots the rejection, which questioned whether the specification had adequately identified the T cell epitopes of SEQ ID NO:2.

3. The objection to "peptide" in claims 27-33 is moot because those claims have been cancelled.

4. The rejection of claims 5, 7, 10, 22-25 and 27-33 as indefinite by virtue of the recitation of both "peptide" and "protein" is moot as Applicants have amended claims 5 and 10 to refer only to "protein", and have cancelled claims 7, 22-25 and 27-33.

5. With regard to the provisional objections to claims 7 and 10, as being substantial duplicates of claim 5, these are mooted by the amendment of claim 10 to recite a second component not recited in 5. Basis for the amendment to claim 10 is at P19, L14-30. Claim 7 has been cancelled.

6. Claim 5 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to obviate the prior art rejection of claim 5, and dependent claims 7 and 10 as anticipated by Melgosa, et al. Hence, that rejection is now moot.

7. Claims 13 and 18, as amended, are drawn to methods of using the protein of claim 5, and should be rejoined pursuant to MPEP 821.04.

USSN - 09/446,677

The remaining withdrawn claims have been cancelled.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By:

  
Roger P. Cooper  
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528  
IPC:lms  
G:\ipc\n-q\Plou\birkelund1\pto amend5.wpd